

in my office had outed a security agent for punishment for someone telling the truth.

Whether there was a crime or not, any President, and this President has said so, should fire a person who discloses secret information of a covert agent's identity in part to punish a person who told the truth in criticizing the administration.

Even if that is not a crime, it is a crime against the code of the west and the expectations of millions of Americans, where we do not allow our elected officials to punish us for criticizing the administration. We do not allow a President's agents to jeopardize a man's wife who is a secret agent, and expose their two young children, and this couple have two of the most delightful young children that you will ever meet in your life, and you can assume that this covert agent for the CIA mother has the same concerns about her children that you would when you are a covert agent and someone has blown your cover, and then they attack Mr. Wilson's wife.

The President has an obligation that goes beyond simply upholding this felony laws of America. His obligation to Americans is greater than that. And he ought to call these people in and say, did you have anything to do with this? And if they did, he needs to make a decision about their continued employment. And yet he refuses to do that. That is most troublesome. You know, there are fifth amendment privileges. There are all of these little technicalities in the law. This is not a technicality, we are standing up for the proposition that Americans should not be abused in this regard.

We are running out of time. I want to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to very briefly take this to another level. And it is about truth and trust. I, as a former ambassador representing the United States of America, was trained in the State Department as to confidentiality and secret missions that were taking place around this globe. The audacity of someone in the Executive Branch even making reference to a covert agent violates that confidentiality and puts us all at risk.

It is not something you play with. It is not something you use for retaliation. When you out an agent, you are outing all of us.

Our intelligence functions on us having operatives in places where people are plotting against our Nation. Our defense will be in the fact that they bring that information to us and we prepare our defenses.

If these people are exposed, they no longer can gather the information that can save lives and property. So I think this is the most heinous act. I am not even going to get into the debate whether it is prosecutable or not. But, any leader in the executive branch ought to understand that you cannot have people there who will leak this in-

formation. The safety of all of our citizens depends on the confidentiality.

Mr. INSLEE. I think the Congresswoman has brought up another point, and that is, the nature of this agent who is a covert agent operating under cover for her own protection, and those people, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) indicated, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) indicated, the people that she worked with, the people that she had lunch with in various countries around the world are now suspect.

But it was interesting in the litany of excuses for this misconduct that we have heard out of the White House for the last few days or at least their operatives around the country, one of the excuses I have heard is that the deputy chief of staff, Mr. Rove, did not know that this CIA agent was a covert agent. He just did not know that.

And, therefore, he wants to excuse that misbehavior since he did not know she was covert. Maybe she could have been just a receptionist at the front desk. There is a problem with that. When you out a CIA agent, you darn well better know whether they are covert or not before you violate your security clearance in outing that CIA agent.

And unless we hear a real good reason that Mr. Rove asked the CIA and was told inappropriately or something, there is no excuse for someone in the highest levels of government, with supposedly the sophistication working at the right hand of the President of the United States, not to know you did not out a CIA agent knowing they could be covert.

The damage that has been done here to our security, to Joe Wilson's spouse, to our trust in the Federal Government, was occasioned, regardless of the intention of the deputy chief of staff, one way or another there has been an abuse of both the family and our sense of national security.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that a deputy chief of staff in the White House to even mention the name of Ambassador Wilson, not naming his wife would not know, because she is the one that sent him over there to Niger.

□ 1600

So how did Robert Novak get the information to print her name in the press? So I do not buy the excuses. I do not think the American people, knowing the truth, will buy the excuses. What we have all lost is the faith and the trust in this administration to deal straightforwardly with the American people, and as the gentleman has so brilliantly enumerated all the other misinformation activities involving this administration. We must stop it and we must stop it now because the reputation of the United States has sunk to its lowest point.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for joining me.

I would like to conclude with a couple of comments. This is the greatest

Nation on Earth, and it is the greatest because it works on a principle that our citizens should be in control of our democracy, not people in power.

It works on the assumption that that power will not be abused. It works on the principle that our elected officials will tell us the truth. It works on the principles that people's wives should not be attacked when a person fulfills their patriotic duty to go to Africa and ferret out the truth.

It works on the principle that people are human and they can make mistakes; but when they make mistakes, they ought to be candid and forthright with Americans. And the sooner the President of the United States is forthright and tells us what happened in this situation, the better off both for the White House and for us as a whole. And if it refuses to do that, which it is now stonewalling in its finest tradition of those who were caught red-handed, it is refusing to give Americans information.

That is why this House of Representatives needs to pass this resolution of inquiry so that we can have a bipartisan review of what happened here. Why? So that we can regain the bipartisan trust we need to go forward with and deal with our pressing problems in Iraq, our pressing problems with the threat of terrorism, and we can get back on track in this government.

Before I close, I want to thank the Wilson family for their courage in going to Africa. I want to thank Mrs. Wilson for her courage as an employee of the CIA. I want to thank them for their courage in standing up to the administration that has so willfully abused them. And I hope that the truth that they have worked so hard to bring to the American people will ultimately prevail in this affair.

#### HONORING RICHARD LEE WILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Miss McMORRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. I rise today to honor Richard Lee Wiles, my friend, my former economic development and technical education coordinator, and a man who was as brilliant and far-sighted as he was straightforward and unpretentious; the kind of man who brought dignity and integrity and a great deal of expertise to everything he did in life.

I am sad to report that late in June, Richard, or Dick as he was known to friends and strangers alike, passed away while conducting his duties on behalf of people of the 5th district of Pennsylvania.

Dick was more than an employee. He was a true friend and a loyal confidant. Dick graduated in 1958 from East Brady High School and in 1963 from Penn State University where he received a

bachelor's degree in agriculture and later a master's degree in communication.

For many years he operated Nova Productions, a public relations firm that was very successful. But, Madam Speaker, more than just a knowledgeable counselor and an able communicator, Dick Wiles was truly a renaissance man. Evidence of this can be seen during his high school and college years when to pay for his education, Dick started and was an active member in a well known dance band, The Rhythm Knights.

Indeed, he was a gentleman of the highest order who could cook, sing, fish, hunt, dance, paint, write poetry and prose, and charm everyone present within the sound of his voice. I used to joke that his charm almost earned him a seat in the Pennsylvania General Assembly over 25 years ago when he came within a few hundred votes of defeating a long-term popular incumbent, despite receiving absolutely no support, financial or otherwise, from the party structure or apparatus.

Madam Speaker, Dick Wiles was one of the most politically savvy and intelligent, gifted people I have ever met. What made him special, though, was how he selflessly used his talent to serve his neighbors and better his community. More than once Dick told me that he loved his job so much that he felt guilty for receiving a pay check.

But more than a humble public servant, Dick will be remembered as a humble servant of God, a man who deeply cared about the condition of his country; a husband who cherished his beautiful wife, Barbara; a father who loved his wonderful daughters, Julia and Jennifer; a grandfather who pampered his four lovely grandchildren, Seanna, Taylor, Alex and Colin; and was fond and took great care of his sister-in-law, Debbie, and her son, Ricky; a friend who reminded us all of what could be accomplished with a little hard work, gritty determination and general good will towards his fellow man.

He was one of the finest conversationalists I have met and one of the most inquiring minds I ever dealt with. His interests were broad. His memory was phenomenal.

Two years ago, Dick lost his lovely wife, Barb, unexpectedly. Since then he lived alone in east Brady and was very lonely. I knew that and I always had chatted with him often and always enjoyed those conversations, but I made it a habit to call him numerous times per day. I talked to him several times daily. I would call him on my way to the Capitol for a vote. I would call him in my apartment in the evenings. We would have lengthy chats. I would call him when I was traveling in my district at home because I have a large rural district. I enjoyed those visits I think more than he because he gave so much.

Madam Speaker, Dick was a phenomenal leader on several issues. He

helped me develop technical education in the 5th district by helping equip our high schools with the newest, latest technology, and bringing technical schools and community colleges to help train our adults for the skilled technical jobs that are vital in today's high-tech economy. That was an education that we lacked.

He also was my staff person who was my specialist to help promote tourism in the 5th district. He was my steady voice on Governor Rendell's Pennsylvania Wilds Working Group, a group joining 13 counties together in beautiful north central Pennsylvania to develop our tourism potential, an area rich in natural beauty, historic sites and scenic Route 6, Pennsylvania's elk herd, Kinzua Lake and the Allegheny National Forest.

Dick truly loved his work and he was so good at it. He truly adored his family, his community, his State and his country. He was always a gentleman.

Dick, we really miss you.

Madam Speaker, I humbly submit these comments to the RECORD, and I humbly commit his spirit to the communion of saints above. May Dick rest in peace.

#### REFORMING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to engage, I hope, in a discussion with my colleagues about an important issue confronting our country, and it is an issue on which we have already begun a national dialogue. It is an issue that, at least before the last few months, was an issue of bipartisan concern, and that is reforming Social Security.

As you know, Madam Speaker, the former President of this Nation, Bill Clinton, raised this issue during his tenure in office and noted that the Social Security program in its current structure is in trouble and in need of reform. It is facing several serious problems.

One of them is the solvency of the program over time. And another is its fairness to the younger generations. There is a new idea here in Washington and a simple idea that has surfaced just within the last few weeks on Social Security reform that does not solve the entire problem in one fell swoop, but would start us on a path and would address the most egregious problem of all, and that is the structure of Social Security which simply is unsustainable in its current form. So I want to focus this discussion this afternoon largely on that new idea.

It is an idea that responds as the House should respond to the concerns and the interests of the American people about what is happening with their Social Security taxes, their payroll

taxes. Let me begin with some of the basics.

As I think all Americans understand on both sides of the aisle, the Social Security system as it is structured today is a pay-as-you-go system. It is a system where those of us working today in the workforce pay in our payroll taxes and those payroll taxes by and large immediately go out the door to pay the retirement benefits of the Americans who are retired today. That is the structure of the current system, and that is the structure that many countries around the world created some 35 to 40 to 50 years ago.

Germany, I think, was first to substitute a Social Security program for its elderly based on this premise, that is, that we would tax workers to pay retirement benefits for those retired. There was nothing wrong with that proposal when initiated because at that time the workforce was dramatically larger than those who were on retirement. Indeed, I think most Americans now know that in 1935 when Social Security was created, there were some 42 Americans working for every American collecting retirement benefits. Clearly, 42 workers can, through their payroll taxes, support one retiree. But as most Americans know by today, those numbers have changed dramatically.

In the 1950s, it went to where we had roughly 15 or 16 workers per retiree. Again, that was sustainable. But now we face a new problem. The reality is that the workforce relative to the number of people retired has shrunk and today in America there are only 3.3 working Americans paying payroll taxes to support each individual currently retired and collecting Social Security taxes. If the trends continues, and it will, that is unsustainable. Very soon we will be down to where there are two workers and even less than two workers paying Social Security taxes, payroll taxes to support each retiree. That simply cannot be sustained over time. And so we have a problem with the structure of Social Security. We also have a problem with its long-term solvency. And, most importantly, I think we have a problem with what is referred to as generational fairness.

We all know that solvency is the issue of whether or not we have the money set aside to pay the benefits we have promised, and in point of fact we do not. While the system runs a short-term surplus today, we collect more in Social Security taxes than we pay out today in Social Security benefits. That short-term Social Security surplus of revenues in over benefits paid out will end as soon as 2017. Indeed, the surplus itself will begin to shrink, that is go down, year to year as early as 2008.

So this is a problem that confronts us very soon, and as the actuaries have told us and as I think Americans understand, the trust fund which we would have to begin drawing upon in 2017 to pay the promised benefit will itself be depleted by 2042. Thus, we have a long-term solvency problem